

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 45 and 47 have been amended. Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 11, 14-17, 19-22, 24, 25, 35-43 and 45-49 are pending and under consideration.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 101

Claims 45 and 47 were rejected under 35 USC 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Appropriate correction has been made to claims 45 and 47 to comply with 35 USC 101. Specifically, claim 45 has been amended to the method of claim 45 to a storage machine and claim 47 has been amended to recite a computer in the body of the claim.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 103

Claims 1-4, 11, 16, 17, 19-22, 36-38, 40, 42-45 and 47 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey et al. (US 5,703,655) (hereinafter "Corey") in view of Kawase et al. (EP 1 063 797) (hereinafter "Kawase").

Claims 35, 39, 41, 46 and 48 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Kawase and further in view of Chen (US 2002/0136538) (hereinafter "Chen").

Claims 6, 7, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Kawase and further in view of Jain et al. (US 6,360,234) (hereinafter "Jain").

Claims 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Kawase and further in view of Thomas et al. (US 6,847,395) (hereinafter "Thomas").

Claim 49 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corey in view of Kawase and further in view of Official Notice.

Claims 1-4, 6, 7 and 35

Claim 1 recites: "...determining a category item for the A/V signal using feature information included in at least one of system information and additional information of the received A/V signal; storing search information about the A/V signal, the search information including the category item..."

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that the primary reference Corey does not discuss the feature of claim 1 of determining a category item for the A/V signal using feature information included in at least one of system information and additional information of the received A/V signal. Instead, the Office Action continues to rely on Kawase to show this feature of claim 1 and specifically relies on the abstract, paragraphs [0011]-[0014] and [0117]-[0120] and Figures 7 and 8 of Kawase.

Kawase discusses a digital broadcast reception apparatus which can immediately display program information of the genres the viewer desires in program information searches for digital broadcasts. The control unit 409 extracts channels and genres of the programs from the short program information, and also stores a genre information database which shows relationships between the channels and genres in the storage unit 407. When having received specification of desired genres from the viewer, the control unit 409 searches the long program information for the program information of the channels corresponding to the genres that match the desired genres in the genre information database. The display control unit 406 displays the obtained program information as the search result. Kawase, Abstract.

However, Kawase clearly discusses that “genre information relates **channels** to genres.” Kawase, paragraph [0118] (Emphasis Added). Accordingly, Kawase does not obviate the technical feature of claim 1 of determining **a category item for the A/V signal using feature information**. Specifically, the channel input in Kawase only determines genre information for the entire channel, rather than determining the category of the A/V signal depending on the feature information. A digital broadcast reception unit receives dozens, if not hundreds, of channels, and each channel then has dozens of features. But neither Kawase nor Corey discuss determining a category item for the A/V signal using **feature information**.

This technical feature of claim 1 provides that the category information of an A/V signal is stored when the A/V signal is recorded on a storage medium so that the A/V signal stored in the storage medium may be searched for by category. Thus, a user is allowed to easily search for a desired A/V signal even if many A/V signals are stored in the storage medium. By contrast, in a system such as disclosed in Kawase, a user could only determine which channel relates to which genre, without being able to identify category information of an A/V signal of a specific stored A/V category.

Further, it is respectfully noted that Corey performs selecting a category **by a user's input information** as disclosed at 10:5-10:17 of Corey. Regarding Hiroahi, Hiroahi performs program information searching **by user's input information** as disclosed in paragraph [0011] –

[0014] of Hiroahi. By contrast, claim 1 recites the technical feature of determining a category item for the A/V signal using feature information of the received A/V signal **regardless of user's input information**.

It is also respectfully submitted that Kawase does not relate to a method of **recording** an A/V signal, and therefore there is no motivation to combine Corey with Kawase. To the contrary, it is stated objective of Kawase to reduce storage capacity as noted in paragraph [0010] of Kawase.

Further, this feature is also not discussed in the secondary references Chen, Jain and Thomas.

Claims 2-4, 6, 7 and 35 depend on claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 11, 14-17 and 39

Claim 11 recites: "...a demultiplexing processor for demultiplexing one of the input A/V signal, extracting feature information in which a category of the input A/V signal is seized, and transmitting the input A/V signal to the first storage medium; a controller for determining and storing a category item for the input A/V signal based on the feature information provided from the demultiplexing processor and controlling the demultiplexing processor to record the input A/V signal to the first storage medium; and a second storage medium storing search information including the category item for the A/V signal, wherein the feature information is included in at least one of system information and additional information of the input A/V signal."

Similar to the argument for claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that determining or extracting a category item from an audio/video signal using feature information included in at least one of system information and additional information of the audio/video signal, and storing search information including the category item is a feature not discussed in the primary reference Corey or the secondary references Kawase, Chen, Jain and Thomas.

In particular, it is respectfully submitted that the reference relied on to show this feature, Kawase, only discusses a channel input where genre information is determined for the entire channel, rather than determining the category of the A/V signal depending on the feature information.

Claims 14-17 and 39 depend on claim 11 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 19-22, 24, 25 and 41

Claim 19 recites: "...a determining unit determining a category item for the A/V signal using feature information included in at least one of system information and additional information of received A/V signal..."

Similar to the argument for claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that determining or extracting a category item from an audio/video signal using feature information included in at least one of system information and additional information of the audio/video signal, and storing search information including the category item is a feature not discussed in the primary reference Corey or the secondary references Kawase, Chen, Jain and Thomas.

In particular, it is respectfully submitted that the reference relied on to show this feature, Kawase, only discusses a channel input where genre information is determined for the entire channel, rather than determining the category of the A/V signal depending on the feature information.

Claims 20-22, 24, 25 and 41 depend on claim 19 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reasons.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

Claims 36-38, 40, 42, 43 and 45-49

Independent claims 36-38, 40, 42, 43, 45, 47 and 49 recite features relating to determining or extracting a category item from an audio/video signal using feature information included in at least one of system information and additional information of the audio/video signal, and storing search information including the category item, which are features not discussed in the primary reference Corey or the secondary references Kawase, Chen, Jain and Thomas.

In particular, it is respectfully submitted that the reference relied on to show these features, Kawase, only discusses a channel input where genre information is determined for the entire channel, rather than determining the category of the A/V signal depending on the feature information.

Dependent claims 46 and 48 are dependent on one of claims 45 and 47, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Jan 13, 2010

By: Gregory W. Harper
Gregory W. Harper
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501